

## Durham Research Online

---

### Deposited in DRO:

07 June 2018

### Version of attached file:

Accepted Version

### Peer-review status of attached file:

Peer-reviewed

### Citation for published item:

Sterry, Martin (2018) 'Multivariate and spatial visualisation of archaeological assemblages.', Internet archaeology. (50).

### Further information on publisher's website:

<https://doi.org/10.11141/ia.50.15>

### Publisher's copyright statement:

This article may be used under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution 3.0 (CC BY) Unported licence, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided that attribution to the author(s), the title of the work, the Internet Archaeology journal and the relevant URL/DOI are given.

### Additional information:

## Use policy

---

The full-text may be used and/or reproduced, and given to third parties in any format or medium, without prior permission or charge, for personal research or study, educational, or not-for-profit purposes provided that:

- a full bibliographic reference is made to the original source
- a [link](#) is made to the metadata record in DRO
- the full-text is not changed in any way

The full-text must not be sold in any format or medium without the formal permission of the copyright holders.

Please consult the [full DRO policy](#) for further details.

## Multivariate and spatial visualisation of archaeological assemblages

Martin Sterry,

School of Archaeology and Ancient History

University of Leicester

[mjs66@leicester.ac.uk](mailto:mjs66@leicester.ac.uk)

orcid: [orcid.org/0000-0002-4863-7735](https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4863-7735)

### Summary:

Multivariate analyses, in particular correspondence analysis, (CA) have become a standard exploratory tool for analysing and interpreting variance in archaeological assemblages. While they have greatly helped analysts, they unfortunately remain abstract to the viewer, all the more so if the viewer has little or no experience with multivariate statistics. A second issue with these analyses can arise from the detachment of archaeological material from its spatial location. This article addresses these issues by presenting a novel method for spatially-visualising CA so that these analyses can be interpreted intuitively. The method works by transforming the resultant bi-plots of the CA into colour maps using the HSV colour model, in which the similarity and difference between assemblages directly corresponds to the similarity and difference of the colours used to display them. Utilising two datasets: ceramics from the excavations of the Roman fortress of Vetera I, and *terra sigillata* forms collected as part of 'The Samian Project' the article demonstrates how the method is applied and how it can be used to draw out spatial and temporal trends.

**Keywords:** Multivariate techniques, GIS, visualisation, Vetera 1, Roman Britain, *terra sigillata*

### List of Figures

Figure 1. The Hue-Saturation-Value (left) and Red-Green-Blue (right) colour models applied to an x-y scatter graph. The colours of the symbols equate to the symbols position on the graph.

Figure 2. The Roman fortress of Vetera I showing excavation trenches (red) and reconstructed plan (black). Data compiled and digitised by Steven Ellis, available from Allison 2012.

Figure 3. CA bi-plot of diagnostic sherds fabrics from Vetera I, samples are trenches.

Figure 4. Point distribution of trench centroids coloured by CA axis scores using RGB.

Figure 5. Point distribution of trench centroids coloured by CA axis scores using HSV.

Figure 6. CA bi-plot of diagnostic sherds fabrics from Vetera I with hues used in the HSV colour model.

Figure 7. Interpolations of CA first axis scores

Figure 8. Interpolations of CA second axis scores

Figure 9. Combined interpolations of CA first and second axis scores with an HSV colour model

Figure 10. Interpolations of SCA first axis scores

Figure 11. Interpolations of SCA second axis scores

Figure 12. Combined interpolations of first and second SCA axis scores with an HSV colour model

Figure 13. SCA bi-plot of diagnostic sherds fabrics from Vetera I with hues used in the HSV colour model.

Figure 14. Distribution of different site types with *terra sigillata* assemblages, all phases.

Figure 15. Interpolation and point distribution of CA first axis scores of Samian dataset, all phases.

Figure 16. Interpolation and point distribution of CA second axis scores of Samian dataset, all phases.

Figure 17. Interpolation and point distribution of CA combined first and second axis scores of Samian dataset), all phases.

Figure 18. CA bi-plot of *terra sigillata* forms and sites (coloured by type), all phases.

Figure 19. Interpolation and point distribution of Phase 1 CA first axis scores of Samian dataset.

Figure 20. Interpolation and point distribution of Phase 1 CA second axis scores of Samian dataset

Figure 21. Interpolation and point distribution of Phase 1 CA combined first and second axis scores of Samian dataset

Figure 22. CA bi-plot of *terra sigillata* forms with HSV colour wheel.

Figure 23. Interpolation and point distribution of Phase 2 CA first axis scores of Samian dataset.

Figure 24. Interpolation and point distribution of Phase 2 CA second axis scores of Samian dataset

Figure 25. Interpolation and point distribution of Phase 2 CA combined first and second axis scores of Samian dataset

Figure 26. CA bi-plot of *terra sigillata* forms with HSV colour wheel.

Figure 27. Interpolation and point distribution of Phase 3 CA first axis scores of Samian dataset.

Figure 28. Interpolation and point distribution of Phase 3 CA second axis scores of Samian dataset

Figure 29. Interpolation and point distribution of Phase 3 CA combined first and second axis scores of Samian dataset

Figure 30. CA bi-plot of *terra sigillata* forms with HSV colour wheel.

## **List of tables**

Table 1. Categorisation by ware type of vessels related to eating and drinking at Vetera I. Fabric types taken from Hanel 1995.

Table 2. *Terra sigillata* forms from ‘The Samian Project’ dataset, their categorisation by vessel type and the adaption of these for this paper (vessel types and data adapted from Willis 2005).

Table 3. Raw counts of vessels from ‘The Samian Project’ by phase (vessel types and data adapted from Willis 2005)

Table 4. Mean number of vessels from ‘The Samian Project’ per site by phase (vessel types and data adapted from Willis 2005)

Table 5. Percentage of vessel types from ‘The Samian Project’ by phase (vessel types and data adapted from Willis 2005)

## **Table of Contents**

### **Introduction**

### **Visualising multi-dimensional data**

*1-dimensional data*

*2-dimensional data*

*3-dimensional data*

### **Case studies**

*Case Study 1. Ceramics from Vetera I*

*Case Study 2. Terra sigillata from Roman Britain*

### **Discussion of the method**

### **Conclusion**

### **Acknowledgements**

### **Bibliography**

### **Introduction**

The purpose of this articles is to demonstrate a method for incorporating, interpreting and visualising the results of multivariate analyses, namely correspondence analysis, in a spatial environment. Visualisation is of crucial importance to the themes of this volume and archaeology as a discipline in terms of communicating large and complex datasets in manner that is legible and insightful (Llobera 2011). Two case studies are used to highlight different aspects of this approach. The first case study of ceramic wares from Vetera I examines different ways to visualise spatial structure and zonation between assemblage groups using point distributions and interpolated rasters. The second case study of Samian assemblages from Roman Britain uses the same method to explore ways of visualising spatio-temporal changes.

Correspondence analysis (CA) is a reductive multivariate technique for analysing associations between different variables and samples and is well-suited to exploring archaeological

assemblages which can be divided into a multitude of typologies (Baxter 1994; 2003). In the last decades, CA has become increasingly popular. The technique has been used for interpreting archaeological assemblages, including artefacts (e.g. Cool and Baxter 1999), archaeobotanical remains (e.g. van der Veen 2007; Livarda and van der Veen 2008) and faunal remains (e.g. Manning *et al.* 2013a; 2013b). It has been applied more widely to the analysis of ceramic assemblages from a range of contexts, particularly for its utility in seriation (Van de Velden *et al.* 2009; Peebles and Schachner 2012), and for distinguishing between different cultural groups (Pitts 2007; 2008), and is also widely used among the articles in this volume.

Correspondence analysis maximises the representation of correspondence between rows and columns. CA is typically used to create bi-plots of rows (samples, or in all the examples in this article, archaeological assemblages) and columns (species, types, etc.). In interpreting the results, samples that plot in close proximity to each other on one or more axis should have similar features and correspond with species found that also plot in the same area (the inverse is also true). Thus, this has allowed the observation of archaeological groupings of site types, periods and broad regions. In the case of this article, the technique is used to explicitly ask questions of a spatial nature in relation to different ceramic types.

One weakness of correspondence analysis for archaeological analysis is that it makes no reference to the similarity and difference of spatial neighbours, and has only very limited application in defining past regions from archaeological data. Instead, it requires the *a priori* imposition of regions or fixed geographies. For example, Manning *et al.* (2013a; 2013b) collected data on animal bone NISP (number of identifiable specimens) from early Neolithic sites in Europe. In their correspondence analysis bi-plot of the data, they were able to identify clear regional differences with a tendency for cattle and pig in northern and central Europe and wild species and sheep/goat in the Mediterranean (Manning *et al.* 2013a: fig 2). However, when it came to creating a visualisation of the data, they instead used distributions of pie charts (Manning *et al.* 2013b: figs 12.1, 12.6). These charts were then dislocated from the geography of the sites to which they corresponded so that they could be legible and did not overlap with one another. Through this method, one of the key advantages of the correspondence analysis – a means of data exploration – is lost through the spatial visualisation method used.

Although making use of different data types (i.e. soil chemistry), the method proposed by Dore and López Varela (2010) is of relevance. They used trend-surface analysis to convert their

samples into five raster layers representing different chemical residues. Then drawing on remote sensing techniques these rasters were used as a basis for a principal components analysis and then rescaled to 0-255. The resulting raster dataset was then visualised by assigning the first eigenvector to red, the second to blue and the third to green with the final visualisation image accounting for 84.48 per cent of variation of the original five raster data set. This approach has potential strengths and communicates the underlying spatial structure clearly, but the results do not address one of the key weaknesses of reductive techniques: that they do not create visualisations which are easily comprehensible without the aid of substantial explanatory text.

Visualisation is not straightforward, and ranges from statistical graphics to data art and illustration. It can be used to demonstrate a particular point, or to allow the viewer to explore the data and data analysis themselves. Reductive techniques are often highly meaningful to the analyst with absolute familiarity with their data, but highly abstract to outsiders. This is particularly the case if the viewer has little or no experience with multivariate statistics and reading scatter graphs given the lack of a clear relationship between the original dataset and the output of bi-plots. By any measure, this is not ideal for a visualisation.

### **Visualising multi-dimensional data**

As a reductionist technique, CA is commonly interpreted through the use of one, two or three axes. The challenge for visualising and interpreting a multivariate analysis in a spatial environment lies in how to convert multiple variables into a comprehensive, intelligible and representative visualisation. Interpretation of archaeological examples has tended toward the interpretation of the relative position of samples to one another on the bi-plots (i.e. two axes). I therefore suggest that colour provides a powerful and intuitive (if imperfect) way of conveying the positions of the data. Put simply, if we are most interested in the similarities and differences between the samples, a spread of colours will show which are more or less similar.

#### *1-dimensional data*

The visualisation of a one-dimensional data-plot can and has been achieved with contrasting colours (e.g. black and white) and varying symbol size so that data points that are at one end

of an axis are larger than those in the centre. A divergent colour scheme can also be used so that colours blend from one to another with a neutral colour in the centre (e.g. red to white to blue, see Colorbrewer2.org and Harrower and Brewer 2003).

### *2-dimensional data*

With two-dimensional plots (the bi-plot), we can achieve a similar effect through the use of a colour wheel with colours radiating out from the origin of the bi-plot. Two methods can be used, and in both cases the axis values should be converted from Cartesian to Polar coordinates (Figure 1). In the first method,  $\phi$  corresponds to the hue of the symbol (in this article I have chosen the Hue-Saturation-Value (HSV) colour wheel for its ease of use, but this is not the only possible option, see below) and  $r$  corresponds to the size of the symbol. This gives a similar effect to the method for 1-dimensional data in that points that are further away from the origin are more distinctive (larger) than points that are closer. The second method is to further colour the symbols by equating  $r$  with a value (i.e. brightness) so that points that are closer to the centre are less intense (i.e. darker) and therefore difficult to distinguish from one another.

An alternative approach is to use the Red-Green-Blue (RGB) colour model with a colour assigned to each axis related to red, green or blue (e.g. Red=Axis 1, Green=Axis 2). While this can create visually striking outputs, the results are not easily interpreted. Different combinations of RGB values can create colours that appear similar to one another (i.e. colour similarity no longer relates directly to the closeness of data-points) and there is no straightforward way to link a colour back to a space or direction on the data-plot with the origin coloured. This can potentially obscure meaningful patterning in the data.

### *3-dimensional data*

The visual interpretation of three-dimensional plots is challenging, and is perhaps most commonly used when the data can be seen to form distinctive and spatially separated groups (such as familial groups). The RGB colour model can readily be adapted to three dimensions (with the same caveats as described above), but the conical HSV model is not suitable. The CIELAB colour space (defined by the *Commission Internationale de l'Eclairage*), designed to represent all possible colours perceived by humans, is spherical and presents another possible alternative with L (0=black, 100=white), a (-a=green, +a=red) and b (-b=blue, +b=yellow),



although a large proportion of the coordinate space is either not visible to human vision or not displayable on a standard computer display, which creates other problems.

## **Case studies**

In the remainder of this article, I demonstrate two different applications of the methods described here to case studies with varying forms of data, scale and temporal depth. In both, I strive to communicate the trends that I have observed in the data as clearly and simply to the viewer as possible.

### *Case Study 1. Ceramics from Vetera I*

The first case study is the ceramic assemblage from the site of Vetera I, a late first century BC and early first century CE Roman fortress at Xanten, Germany (Hanel 1995; Allison 2008; 2013). Excavations produced a vessel assemblage of c. 9000 diagnostic sherds from 520 trenches (Figure 2). The data are particularly suited for querying whether different groups within the fortress (e.g. officers, soldiers, etc.) had different, and perhaps spatially segregated, dining practices which are identifiable in their discarded ceramics (cf. Allison, introduction to this volume, where Figure 2 presents percentages of Vetera I tablewares and their form types). The ceramics can be divided by fabric or form to create tables suitable for correspondence analysis with the trenches treated as discrete samples. A version of this analysis here is presented in Allison and Sterry 2014; this article updates and builds upon the initial analysis with greater emphasis on method and visualisation. There are constraints to this analysis, the ceramics themselves were not available for analysis and so it was not possible to modify the categorisation of Hanel (1995) into something that was better suited to identifying distinct dining practices. A new categorisation from the dataset using a combination of fabric and form (i.e. South-Gaulish bowl, Belgic platter, etc.) may be more effective, but equally we might consider the vessel diameter or height to be pertinent (variables not consistently available from the dataset). In this paper, only fabric is used (Table 1) to allow for a more straightforward focus on the method of analysis. A correspondence analysis of the data table creates a bi-plot with a good distribution of the different fabric types and trenches (Figure 3). Ceramics of similar origin and type cluster with each other, hence we can distinguish wares of Italian origin (thin-walled wares and possibly so-called Pompeian red-slip wares, see Hanel 1995: 257-259), wares more closely related to food preparation and storage (mortaria, amphorae, and various

other coarse or ‘utilitarian’ wares) and non-ceramic vessels of bronze and glass. The different *terra sigillata* types, Arretine and South Gaulish, are also well defined and opposed to each other.

Using these axis values, RGB and HSV colour models (as described above) were generated. For the RGB colour models, the first and second axes were independently scaled to run from 0 to 255. These revised scores were then added as an attribute to a point-distribution of trench centroids and used to create thematic point distribution (Figure 4; this can be done in QGIS using the definition `color_rgb([axis-1],[axis-2],0)` note that blue is set to 0). For the HSV colour model, the first and second axis scores were first converted to polar coordinates and then scaled so that  $\phi$  runs from 0-360 and  $r$  from 0-100 (Figure 5). Again, in QGIS, the definition is `color_hsv([ $\phi$ ],100,[ $r$ ])` (note that saturation is set to 100). The same approach could also be used with the polygon layer of the trenches themselves, but centroids are preferred for their clarity.

In the RGB colour model (Figure 4), the dominant colour is orange with a strong cluster of greens in the centre and dark reds and browns scattered around. This highlights that the trenches across the central buildings had different assemblages to other parts of the fort (with the northern trenches registering as in between) and that there is a strong spatial structure to the data. However, more rigorous interrogation of the data is necessary in order to associate these colours with the original bi-plot (Figure 3). Figures 5 and 6 can be used together to interpret patterns more directly. The same basic division into three colour groups is still apparent, but now it can be seen that black represents those trenches with axis values close to the origin, greens are trenches correlated with Arretine wares and oranges are more closely correlated with non-ceramic vessels (i.e. glass and bronze vessels), or alternatively, inversely correlated to utilitarian wares and amphorae.

As an aid to interpretation, a further step can be taken to interpolate between the locations of the trenches on the assumption that the finds from a trench can be taken as representative of the general area in which they may have been used. An inverse-distance-weighted interpolation was used on the trench centroids with the axis values used as Z-values (the weighting of the

interpolation) and number of points set to 50. This created raster layers of interpolated values for axis 1 and axis 2 (layers could be created for each axis of the CA if desired). As discussed above with relation to 1-dimensional data, these can be displayed with a divergent colour scheme (Figures 7 and 8). Combining 2 axes is also possible with the preferred use of an HSV colour model requiring a transformation of raster values from Cartesian to polar coordinates (creating a  $\phi$  raster with values 0-360 and an  $r$  raster scaled to values of 0-100). These raster values can then be combined to form a single image (Figure 9) which is the correlate of the point distribution (Figure 5).

In both the interpolation of the first and second axis, we can see again the distinctive signature of the central buildings vs. the more peripheral buildings within the fortress. There is also a second spatial structure visible on the first axis with consistently positive values in the western buildings and south-east corner of the fortress. This is more apparent in the combined HSV interpolation in which the central buildings are green (negative first axis, positive second axis), the eastern buildings tend to dark orange (negative first axis, negative second axis) and the western buildings to dark blue (positive first axis, positive second axis).

From this analysis, although we have only plotted fabric types, we can perhaps suggest how different parts of the fortress, or different status groups, may have tended towards different types of food-related activities and begin to identify a spatial structure in the data which could be investigated further. We can divide the buildings into zones which have the potential to reflect different patterns of practice and consumption, with the *principia* and ‘senior officers’ houses’ in the centre, the building to the south-west and the street to the east as further zones. Continuing with this example, the central *principia*, ‘senior officers’ houses’ and open market are in front of the *principia* tend toward imported finewares such as the Arretine *terra sigillata* and non-ceramic vessels. The barracks and Neronian building to the east perhaps have more Gaulish *terra sigillata* and fewer vessels of utilitarian wares. The building in the south-west, the alleged *valetudinarium*, has higher quantities of utilitarian wares. The general pattern is of a robust spatial structure to the overall distribution.

Although inferring building and foodways patterns from the analysis is difficult, it is clear that there is spatial structuring in the dataset. If we were to use a range of categorisations (e.g. fabric, form or a combination of both), the same analysis could be re-run to identify the categorisation with the most helpful spatial structure. A second issue relates to the underlying

tendency of correspondence analysis to overemphasise the importance of small assemblages and rare fabrics/forms. A resolution to this can be found in the use of the ‘multispati’ function of the *ade4* package in R (Chessel *et al.* 2004; Dray and Dufour 2007) to run a spatial correspondence analysis (SCA). Multispati uses a spatial weights matrix of the locations of the samples (in this case the x and y coordinates of the trench centres) to weight a multivariate analysis by the Moran’s I scores of the eigenvalues. This effectively selects combinations of variables that maximise the variance explained by spatial descriptors (Dray *et al.* 2008). The resulting bi-plot identifies which species (fabrics) are best correlated with the spatial distribution of trenches (i.e. has the greatest spatial auto-correlation). As an example, the same dataset has been processed using the multispati function and visualised using the same method as described above (Figures 10, 11, 12 and 13).

Comparing the results of the SCA with the CA, a stronger spatial structure is apparent and we can perhaps more confidently identify zoning (Figure 12) – the principia and central buildings (purple), the alleged *valetudinarium* and western buildings (green) and a zone to the northwest not identified by the CA alone (compare with Figure 9), but the area of the so-called tribunes’ residences (orange). Unfortunately, interpreting which wares drive this distribution is not straightforward, as we can see from the bi-plot (Figure 13). The first axis groups Arretine *terra sigillata* with Belgic *terra rubra* and southern Gaulish *terra sigillata* with Belgic *terra nigra*, which is essentially the result of a chronological division between the early and mid-first century AD. Earlier forts, from the Augustan period, have indeed been identified in this central area and so no doubt are partly responsible for this spatial structure (see Allison 2013: 109-133). The second axis is less easily understood, but many of the wares in the negative portion – Mortaria, utilitarian wares, amphorae and Pompeian red slip-ware are more suited for preparation and cooking rather than serving. However, this division is slightly different to that observed from the CA and hence implies different activities in the buildings. A fuller exploration of the different vessels and their find spots may resolve these differences. They may also relate to the quality of the original dataset, with long trenches that extended over multiple buildings (but which this analysis has reduced down to centre points). However, the spatial structure observed and the drivers of it identified from the bi-plot appear plausible. In this sense, the greatest strength of both the CA and SCA (and their spatial visualisation) is their role in exploring a dataset and understanding its underlying structures rather than producing a single final conclusion. Or, to put another way: more analysis is necessary!

### *Case Study 2. Terra sigillata from Roman Britain*

The identification of chronological change using a correspondence analysis of archaeological material should be common. This is all the more true of ceramic data (particularly Roman material), in which identifying chronological shifts or divisions has been a fundamental principle of analysis. Although this has resulted in datasets that are less suited to analyses of use and practice, it also creates the potential for detailed and reliable phasing. The second case study involves only *terra sigillata* forms collected as part of ‘The Samian Project’ (Willis 1997; 1998; 2004; 2005; 2011). The aim of this study is to demonstrate how correspondence analysis can be used explicitly to consider temporal changes in regional distributions. This new analysis described below makes use of a dataset of 179 phased ceramic groups from across Roman Britain. These range in date from AD 30-277, and I have split the groups into three arbitrary phases based on natural breaks in the data: AD 40-80; AD 80-160 and AD 160-300 (or early, middle and late). Although the phases are of uneven length and only loosely correlate with pre-existing archaeological or historical chronologies, they provide the best split for ‘The Samian Project’s’ dataset, producing the fewest number of sites with assemblages overlapping the phase boundaries. Where phase overlapping was unavoidable, sites have been grouped within the phase for which they have the greatest overlap. The ceramic forms were taken directly from Willis’ dataset and simplified into the categories: Beaker or Jar, Bowl or Dish, Cup, Cup or Dish, Decorated Bowl, Decorated Beaker, Platter (see Tables 2, 3, 4 and 5 for the categorisation, raw numbers, numbers per site, and percentages). Some basic trends in the data are apparent and already known (Willis 2004; 2011). For example: ‘Bowl or Dish’ increases markedly over time (from an initial 6.24% per ceramic group to 43.82 %) while ‘Platter’ decreases (39.13% to 4.79%).

The spatial distribution of sites has good coverage, although with some clusters more evident in the south-east and along Hadrian’s Wall (Figure 14). Site types are less well distributed, with military sites in the west and north, rural and small centres in the east midlands and south east and major civil centres largely in the south. Military sites are far more heavily represented in the earlier phase, and the same is true of smaller and rural centres in the later phase. However, the overall coverage and variety of site types can be considered reasonably consistent across the three phases. The dataset is therefore suitable for considering how the use of *terra sigillata* varied by region and over time.

All ceramic groups were analysed together with a correspondence analysis (Figure 15). As expected, the first axis is dominated by the opposition of ‘Platter’ to ‘Bowl or Dish’ with the former plotting positive and the latter negative. Decorated vessels are roughly on the origin of the first axis, but ‘Cups’ and ‘Cups or Dishes’ are more positive and ‘Beaker or Jar’ more negative. The second axis is largely a split between decorated vessels (negative) and non-decorated vessels (positive), ‘Cups or Dishes’ are also negative. Considering the different site types, it is clear that assemblages from military sites tend more towards decorated vessels (Willis 2011, compare Mees, this volume;), and small and rural centres tend more towards undecorated vessels although all site types have wide distributions across the bi-plot.

As before, we can visualise these axis values spatially (Figures 16, 17 and 18). This identifies two different trends – positive and negative axis-1 values have overlapping distributions (albeit with more negative values in the north) while positive axis-2 values tend towards the north and west with negative values to the south and east. Together, these suggest that there is a strong spatial component to the results. This obscures temporal trends, except that more northerly sites tend to be later in date.

However, if we visualise the phases individually then a clearer pattern emerges. In order to enhance the visualisation, the axis values have been interpolated by phase, using only the data points of that phase (Figures 19-30; note that due to this phasing, the multispati method described above {Chessel *et al.* 2004; Dray and Dufour 2007} should not be used as this would emphasise spatial structures across all phases simultaneously rather than by individual phase). Each phase depicts only a portion of the bi-plot, but the colour model used for both single and dual axis interpolations remains the same so that visualisations of different phases are directly comparable. As a result, it is now possible to identify some fairly strong shifts in spatial patterning. The temporal change identified in the first axis (Figures 19, 23, 27) is all the more evident as the interpolation shifts from positive values (characterised by platters and cups) for the early phase to negative values for the middle and late phases (characterised by ‘bowl or dish’). The second axis reaffirms the link between decorated forms and the military community with these plotting consistently in the negative part of the graph (Figures 20, 24, 28). In the early phase, this includes major centres such as Lincoln, Exeter and St Albans, but also nearby sites such as Dragonby. The combined axis plots (Figures 21, 25, 29) give a sense of change over time in overall assemblage composition, but also shifting groups with a military

community most apparent (pinks shifting to orange) and an increasingly visible rural community (greens) while the assemblages from urban centres remain highly varied.

The visualisation is not without its drawbacks. Visual artefacts are more evident in these figures, and the interpolation especially cannot be used to predict the characteristics of sites not included in the analysis (due to the volatility in the dataset, and the range of factors beyond spatial location). However, the results are very effective in communicating the patterns suggested by Willis (2004; 2011) through better visualisation of the complexities in the data. Furthermore, the analysis demonstrates that temporal changes in ceramic consumption was not uniform across Roman Britain, nor that ceramics more commonly associated with the military communities were confined solely to military sites. These may be ‘common-sense’ interpretations, but nonetheless they are difficult to demonstrate using more conventional graph types.

### **Discussion of the method**

Correspondence analysis has been used for analysing a wide array of categorical data (i.e. divided on the basis of a qualitative property), including archaeobotanical, faunal, ceramic, glass and small finds. Provided that there is consistency in the data collection and recording methodologies, there is no reason that such data cannot also be visualised spatially (see Sterry 2010 for an early iteration of this spatial correspondence analysis applied to fieldwalking scatters). However, this form of analysis requires both rich, high- quality data-sets and good spatial coverage to be effective. The two case studies here use respectively 520 and 177 different assemblages, yet both partly suffer from poor spatial coverage.

The use of such a broad spectrum of colours in the visualisations will be less effective for some viewers, especially for those with colour vision deficiencies. Even for those without, the HSV colour wheel is far from perfect. It is easy to use for image editing, but quite poor at representing the spectrum of human vision as the colours are not evenly distributed and the primaries (red, green, blue in the HSV colour wheel) do not have the same lightness. This makes it harder to intuitively assess similarity and difference between colours satisfactorily. similar problems exist when the plots are viewed through different media – screen, projection and print. One option would be to use a different colour model, for example, the Munsell chart (or CIELAB as discussed earlier), however, these are all more computationally complicated to

translate. Not only would this make the visualisation more time-consuming to produce, but it would also create issues for some viewers as it would be less clear how the visualisation was created from the data and therefore whether it was still a valid representation. The scaling of the bi-plot is also an issue, in this paper the first axis and second axis scores have not been standardised or otherwise adjusted. There is potential to vary this scaling; axis values could be weighted by the inertia of the axis to better incorporate the different variance as explained by the first and second axes. Similarly, Value (of HSV) on the combined plots has been scaled with 0 at the origin and 100 scaled to the most distant point. Changing this scaling either by moving 100 closer to 0 (and treating all values more distant as 100) or by using a nonlinear scale (e.g. logarithmic) would be an effective method of reducing the effect of outliers and emphasising the spatial structure of datapoints that plot closer to 0.

The method of interpolation is also open to debate in terms of the different strengths of inverse-distance-weighting, trend-surface analysis, kriging (Gaussian process regression) etc. In the examples I have provided, I have interpolated and visualised across a Cartesian plane on the basis that physical proximity should normally correlate with similarity of assemblage (Tobler's first law of geography – 'everything is related to everything else, but near things are more related than distant things' Tobler 1970: 236). Measuring distance is potentially problematic at regional and inter-regional scales, however. Barriers such as rivers and seas should be accounted for, although this significantly increases the computational load of the analysis and creates uncertainty over matters such as the location of river crossings in antiquity. Furthermore, it may be more valid to adapt this method to work based on ease of movement across space or even within a network (see especially the work of Van Oyen (2015) on conceptualising the flow of Roman ceramics between sites).

## **Conclusion**

The two case studies considered here draw attention to the vital role that space plays in the composition of archaeological assemblages, whether at the intra-site, regional or inter-regional level. As such, it seems important to incorporate the spatial component into our analyses and recognise not only that we are distinguishing between different types of assemblages, but also different locations at multiple, varying scales. The technique demonstrated in this paper presents one method for addressing this.



## Acknowledgements

I would like to thank Pim Allison and Martin Pitts for their invitation to participate in the Big Data on the Roman Table Network and for their helpful and insightful comments on this paper. I would also like to thank Tyr Fothergill, Maria Gatto, and Mark Gillings for reading and commenting on parts or all of this paper. I am also very grateful to Pim Allison for sharing and discussing the Vetera I dataset and to Steve Willis for discussing the Samian Pottery from Roman Britain dataset.

## Bibliography

Allison, P. and Sterry, M. 2015 “‘Family’ meals? Who ate with whom and where in Roman military bases?’ in L. Vagalinski (ed.) *Proceedings of the XXII Lime Congress, Ruse, Bulgaria Sept 2012*. Sofia: National Archaeological Institute with Museum –Bulgarian Academy of Sciences, 487-94.

Allison, P. 2012. *Engendering Roman Military Spaces [data-set]*. York: Archaeology Data Service [distributor] <https://doi.org/10.5284/1017082>

Allison, P. 2013. *People and Spaces in Roman Military Bases*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Allison, P. 2008. ‘Measuring Women’s Influence on Roman Military Life: using GIS on published excavation reports from the German frontier’, *Internet Archaeology* **24**. <http://dx.doi.org/10.11141/ia.24.5>

Baxter, M.J. 1994. *Exploratory multivariate analysis in archaeology*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Baxter, M.J. 2003. *Statistics in archaeology*. Arnold.

Cool, H.E.M. and Baxter, M.J. 1999. ‘Peeling the onion: an approach to comparing vessel glass assemblages’, *Journal of Roman Archaeology* **12**, 72-100.

Chessel, D., Dufour, A.B. and Thioulouse, J. 2004. ‘The ade4 package – I: One-table methods’, *R News* **4(1)**, 5-10.

- Dore, C.D. and López Varela, S.L. 2010. 'Kaleidoscopes, Palimpsests, and Clay: Realities and Complexities in Human Activities and Soil Chemical/Residue Analysis', *Journal of Archaeological Method and Theory* **13(3)**, 279-302.
- Dray, S. and Dufour, A.B. 2007. 'The ade4 package: implementing the duality diagram for ecologists', *Journal of Statistical Software* **22(4)**, 1-20.
- Dray, S., Saïd, S. and Débias, F. 2008. 'Spatial ordination of vegetation data using a generalization of Wartenberg's multivariate spatial correlation', *Journal of Vegetation Science* **19**, 45-56.
- Hanel, N. 1995. *Vetera I: Die Funde aus den römischen Lagern auf dem Fürstenberg bei Xanten*, vol. 2: Catalogue. Cologne and Bonn: Rudolf Halbelt and Rheinland Verlag.
- Harrower, M.A and Brewer, C.A. 2003. 'ColorBrewer.org: An Online Tool for Selecting Color Schemes for Maps', *The Cartographic Journal* **40(1)**, 27-37.
- Livarda, A. and van der Veen, M. 2008. 'Social access and dispersal of condiments in north-west Europe from the Roman to the medieval period', *Vegetation History and Archaeobotany* **17(Suppl. 1)**, 201-209. doi:10.1007/s00334-008-0168-4.
- Llobera, M. 2010 'Archaeological Visualization: Towards an Archaeological Information Science (AISC)', *Journal of Archaeological Method and Theory* **18 (3)**, 193-223.
- Manning, K., Downey, S.S., Colledge, S., Conolly, J., Stopp, B, Dobney, K. and Shennan, S. 2013a. 'The origins and spread of stock-keeping: the role of cultural and environmental influences on early Neolithic animal exploitation in Europe', *Antiquity* **87**, 1046-59.
- Manning, K., Stopp, B., Colledge, S. Downey, S., Conolly, J., Dobney, K. and Shennan, S. 2013b. 'Animal exploitation in the early Neolithic of the Balkans and central Europe' in Colledge, S., Conolly, J., Dobney, K., Manning, K. and Shennan, S. (eds) *The Origins and Spread of Domestic Animals in Southwest Asia and Europe*. Walnut Creek CA: Left Coast Press, 237-52.
- Peebles, M.A. and Schachner, G. 2012. 'Refining correspondence analysis-based ceramic seriation of regional data sets', *Journal of Archaeological Science* **39(8)**, 2818-27.

- Pitts, M. 2007. 'Consumption, deposition and social practice: a ceramic approach to intra-site analysis in late Iron Age to Roman Britain', *Internet Archaeology* **21**.  
<http://dx.doi.org/10.11141/ia.21.2>
- Pitts, M. 2008. 'Globalizing the local in Roman Britain: An anthropological approach to social change', *Journal of Anthropological Archaeology* **27(4)**, 493-506.
- Sterry, M. 2010. *House, Land and Place: A re-evaluation of central Adriatic communities, 6<sup>th</sup>-1<sup>st</sup> centuries BC*. University of Leicester. Unpublished PhD Thesis.
- Tobler, W.R. 1970 'A Computer Movie Simulating Urban Growth in the Detroit Region', *Economic Geography* **46**, 234-40.
- van de Velden, M., Groenen, P.J.F. and Poblome, J. 2009. 'Seriation by constrained correspondence analysis: A simulation study', *Computational Statistics and Data Analysis* **53**, 3129-38.
- van der Veen, M. 2007. 'Formation processes of desiccated and carbonized plant remains – the identification of routine practice', *Journal of Archaeological Science* **34(6)**, 968-90.  
<http://doi.org/10.1016/j.jas.2006.09.007>
- Van Oyen, A. 2015. 'The Roman City as Articulated through Terra Sigillata', *Oxford Journal of Archaeology* **34(3)**, 279-99.
- Willis, S.H. 1997. *The English Heritage Samian Project. Report on the Results of Phase 1*, University of Durham.
- Willis, S.H. 1998. 'Samian pottery in Britain: exploring its distribution and archaeological potential', *The Archaeological Journal* **155**, 82-133.
- Willis, S.H. 2004. 'Samian Pottery, a Resource for the Study of Roman Britain and Beyond: the results of the English Heritage funded Samian Project. An e-monograph,' *Internet Archaeology* **17**. <http://dx.doi.org/10.11141/ia.17.1>
- Willis, S.H. 2005. *Samian Pottery, a Resource for the Study of Roman Britain and Beyond: The results of the English Heritage funded Samian Project. The Spreadsheet Data*. [data-set]. York: Archaeology Data Service [distributor] <https://doi.org/10.5284/1000243>

Willis, S.H. 2011. 'Samian Ware and Society in Roman Britain and Beyond', *Britannia*, **42** (1), 167-242.